

**SUMMARY REPORT DIGEST-  
COMPLAINT REGISTER INVESTIGATION NO.:  
CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT**

280466

DATE OF REPORT (DAY-MO.-YEAR)

1 Jun 2002

To be used in all cases that are to be classified as either EXONERATED, UNFOUNDED, NOT SUSTAINED or in SUSTAINED cases where the Disciplinary Recommendation does not exceed FIVE (5) DAYS SUSPENSION.

SUBMIT ORIGINAL AND 3 COPIES IF ASSIGNED TO SAME UNIT AS ACCUSED.  
SUBMIT ORIGINAL AND 4 COPIES IF NOT ASSIGNED TO SAME UNIT AS ACCUSED.

TO: SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE

ATTENTION ☒ ADMINISTRATOR IN CHARGE, OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS  
☐ ASSISTANT DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT, INTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION

FROM-INVESTIGATOR'S NAME		RANK	STAR NO.	SOCIAL SEC. NO.	EMPLOYEE NO.	UNIT ASSIGN.	
KELLY Jr., Sidney L.		LT.	351			021	
ADDRESS OF INCIDENT		DATE OF INCIDENT - TIME		BEAT OF INCIDENT	LOCATION CODE*		
24 South State Street, Apt# 901		28 March 2002 - 2300		2113	121		
ACCUSED	NAME	RANK	STAR NO.	SOCIAL SEC. NO.	EMPLOYEE NO.	UNIT ASSIGN.	
	1. GLOVER, Kevin	SGT.	1587			021	
	2. THOMPSON, Terrence	P.O.	16744			021	
	SEX/RACE	D.O.B.	DATE OF APPOINTMENT		DUTY STATUS (TIME OF INCIDENT)		
	1. M/B		1959	9 SEP 1985	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ON DUTY <input type="checkbox"/> OFF DUTY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SWORN <input type="checkbox"/> CIVILIAN	
	2. M/W		1971	7 JUL 1997	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ON DUTY <input type="checkbox"/> OFF DUTY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SWORN <input type="checkbox"/> CIVILIAN	
IF APPLICABLE - DATE ARRESTED/INDICTED		CHARGES		COURT BRANCH	DISPOSITION & DATE		
1. DNA							
2. DNA							
COMPLAINANTS	NAME	ADDRESS**	CITY STATE	TELEPHONE	SEX/RACE	D.O.B./AGE	PHYS. COND. CODE†
					M/B		01
VICTIMS	NAME	ADDRESS**	CITY STATE	TELEPHONE	SEX/RACE	D.O.B./AGE	PHYS. COND. CODE†
	NONE						
WITNESSES	NAME	ADDRESS**	CITY STATE	TELEPHONE	SEX/RACE	D.O.B./AGE	PHYS. COND. CODE†
					F/B	UNK/22	01
					F/B	UNK/26	01

☐ SEE ATTACHED SHEET FOR ADDITIONAL ACCUSED, COMPLAINANTS, VICTIMS, WITNESSES.

ALLEGATIONS

#1 - It is alleged that the officers took \$1,800.00 USC and failed to inventory or return the money to him.  
#2 - It is alleged that the arresting officers left his girlfriend's (also arrested) apartment door (place of arrest) unsecured and her personal belongings were stolen.  
#3 - It is alleged that a police officer took him to a room on the 2nd floor of the 21st District, placed something in his pocket, and he was told "Shut your fuckin mouth about the income tax check."  
#4 - The complainant alleges that police officers conducted a "Warrantless Search" where he was arrested.  
#5 - It is alleged that he tried to make a male black wearing a jacket with a white shirt (he believed to be a supervisor) aware of the missing money, and the person took no action.

**I.A.D. LOCATION CODES\***

01 Food Sales/Restaurant	11 Public Transportation Veh./Facility
02 Tavern/Liquor Store	12 Park District Property
03 Other Business Establishment	13 Airport
04 Police Building	14 Public Property Other
05 Lockup Facility	15 Other Private Premise
06 Police Maintenance Facility	16 Expressway/Interstate System
07 CPD Automotive Pound Facility	17 Public Way - Other
08 Other Police Property	18 Waterway, Incl. Park District
09 Police Communications System	19 Private Residence
10 Court Room	

**I.A.D. PHYSICAL CONDITION CODES†**

01 No Visible Injury - Apparently Normal
02 No Visible Injury - Under Influence
03 Injured, Not Hospitalized
04 Injured, Not Hospitalized - Under Influence
05 Injured, Hospitalized
06 Injured, Hospitalized - Under Influence
07 Injured, Refused Medical Aid
08 Injured, Refused Medical Aid - Under Influence
09 Deceased
10 Deceased - Under Influence

\* IF CPD MEMBER, LIST RANK, STAR, SOCIAL SECURITY, EMPLOYEE NOS. IN ADDRESS BOX, PAX/BELL IN TELEPHONE BOX.

SUMMARY

Briefly summarize the investigation describing your efforts to prove or disprove the allegation(s). Indicate whether witnesses or evidence support or do not support the allegation(s).  
In sustained cases ONLY, copies of the accused member's Summary of Previous Disciplinary Actions and Record of Previous Complimentary History will be included as attachments.

Based on the information in a newspaper article this investigation was initiated by Commander Stanley on 9 May 2002, at 1405 hours.

The allegations were initially brought to her attention after reading an article published as one of several "Letters to the Editor" in the 7 May 2002 issue of the Chicago Defender Newspaper (Att #13). In the article written by the complainant, it was alleged that "Chicago Police Officers forced entry and conducted a warrantless search. The officers stole \$1,800 from the scene. When I arrived at the police station they left the apartment door ajar and thieves stole everything of value from her apartment." "When the officer finished the paperwork he took me to another small room. I thought he was going to beat me up but he put \$100 in my right pocket and told me shut my mouth about the money."

R/Lieutenant was assigned to investigate the above allegations on 13 May 2002, 1200 hours by Commander Stanley, 021st District.

On 13 May 2002, I contacted the Cook County Jail and spoke with Officer C. Canada and made arrangements to interview the complainant on 15 May 2002, at 1100 hours. The interview of the complainant took place in the Cook County Sheriff's, Special Operations Response Team, Interview Room. Present during the interview was Sergeant Kathleen O'Malley #2045, 021st District.

The complainant was advised why we were there and asked to relay the circumstances that prompted him to write a letter to the Chicago Defender Newspaper. The R/Lieutenant read the newspaper article to the complainant verbatim. The complainant stated "the article was printed as I wrote it."

Refer to the Continuation Sheet of Summary Report Digest - Beginning with Page #1 and concluding with Page # 8.

ATTACHMENTS

INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS-  
SUPPORTING ALLEGATION  
LIST ATTACHMENT NUMBERS:

13, 14, 15, 16

INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS-  
SUPPORTING ACCUSED MEMBER(S)  
LIST ATTACHMENT NUMBERS:

2A,3,4 and 17 thru 35

PHYSICAL EVIDENCE  
LIST ATTACHMENT NUMBERS:

19,20,21,22,23,24,25

TOTAL NUMBER OF ATTACHMENTS  
SUBMITTED WITH THIS FILE:

36

FINDINGS--RECOMMENDATIONS

Summarize the findings and recommendations. Rule violations will be cited by number only. One overall recommendation for Disciplinary Action will be made by the investigator. The recommendation will be for ALL sustained findings; recommendations will NOT be made for each sustained allegation.

Example: 1. Violation noted, no disciplinary action warranted. 2. That the accused member be reprimanded. 3. That the accused member be suspended for ..... days (not to exceed 5 days).

Sergeant Kevin Glover #1587

Allegation: #5 - It is alleged that he tried to make a male black wearing a jacket with a white shirt (he believed to be a supervisor) aware of the missing money, and the person took no action.

FINDINGS: UNFOUNDED

RECOMMENDATION: NO DISCIPLINARY ACTION.

Police Officer terrence Thompson #16744

Allegations:

#1 - It is alleged that the officers took \$1,800.00 USC and failed to inventory or return the money to him.

#2 - It is alleged that the arresting officers left his girlfriend's (also arrested) apartment door (place of arrest) unsecured and her personal belongings were stolen.

#3 - It is alleged that a police officer took him to a room on the 2nd floor of the 21st District, placed something in his pocket, and he was told "Shut your fuckin mouth about the income tax check."

#4 - The complainant alleges that police officers conducted a "Warrantless Search" where he was arrested.

FINDINGS: ALL OF THE ABOVE ALLEGATIONS ARE UNFOUNDED.

RECOMMENDATION: NO DISCIPLINARY ACTION.

REVIEWED BY: *PK*

DATE: *8/26/02*

DATE INITIATED  
(DATE COMPLAINT WAS  
RECEIVED FOR INVESTIGATION) 13 May 2002

DATE COMPLETED  
(DATE OF THIS  
REPORT)

1 Jun 2002

ELAPSED TIME  
(TOTAL TIME  
EXPRESSED IN DAYS)

20

Investigator will initiate the Command Channel Review  
form by completing the Investigator's Section.

*351*

IF NECESSARY, USE AN 8½ x 11" SHEET OF WHITE PAPER TO CONTINUE ANY ITEM.

*CR #280466*  
*ATT #2, PS #2*

**SUMMARY REPORT DIGEST  
CONTINUATION SHEET**

RE: Complaint Register Number 280466

In conversation with the complainant he stated he was originally inside his girlfriend's apartment sleep when he heard noise at the door. He jumped up, put on his pants and was met by the police and handcuffed. Moments later they (police officers) woke up his girlfriend ( [REDACTED] - also arrested), told her to put on some clothing since she only had on a bra and panties then they handcuffed her. Once the girlfriend was handcuffed, the police began to search the apartment. He went on to say that the officers found "Weed and Money." "It was \$1,800.00 in there, some of the money was in my bag with the weed." When asked what he meant by "in there", he replied "the back room." When asked how much money was in his bag, he replied "twelve hundred dollars (\$1,200.00). The other six hundred (\$600.00) was my girl's." "There was money in her jacket, but I don't know how much." "She had an income tax check, some of it she spent." The complainant stated "I offered to go to jail if they let my girlfriend go even though I was on parole." Then he advised me an officer stated "She can go if we get a gun." At this point they both (arrestees) replied they did not have a gun. The girlfriend asked to call her sister [REDACTED] - Witness #2), who arrived at the apartment a few minutes later. The complainant stated while they were waiting for [REDACTED] to arrive, a M/W, bald police officer (Accused #2) found the weed and \$1,200.00 (USC) in a back room in his bag. The complainant repeated that his girlfriend had money in her coat, but there was no weed in the coat. The complainant stated that when his girl's sister arrived the police asked her for a gun, and she indicated she did not have one. Shortly after the search of the apartment was concluded, both arrestees were taken downstairs and transported to the 21<sup>st</sup> Police District for processing. I asked the complainant where his girlfriend's sister was when they (arrestees) were taken down stairs. He replied "She was upstairs in the apartment."

In the 21<sup>st</sup> District Tactical Office (Large Room - South end of building) both arrestees were hand cuffed to a bench on the west wall (in front of the window). While there, the complainant stated that he asked the bald officer (accused #2) "What happened to my girl's income tax money." He went on to say "My girl said shut up (while striking me) they already found weed and she was scared." At this point the complainant stated that the bald officer (accused #2) said "Shut up before I beat your fuckin ass. So I shut up to keep from getting hit." The complainant stated "a little while later a black officer with a black jacket and a white shirt (accused #1) came in, he was bout 40-45 years old, big 250 pounds." "I raised my hand to try to talk to him, I said can I talk to you sir." "He said What, What you want, I said they took her income tax money." Jennings then told me "the short bald police officer (accused #2) said you just said you spent that money on the weed we found." "That is when I decided not to say anything else."

The complainant states that a short time later he was released from the rail (where he was handcuffed next to his girlfriend) and the bald police officer (accused #2) took him to a smaller room. He stated "While the officer held onto the handcuffs, he placed something in my right pocket and said shut your fuckin mouth about the income tax money." He states he was then taken downstairs to the lockup. When he entered the lockup, he was searched by one of the people inside (lockup keeper) who pulled some money (\$102.00) out of his right pocket. He stated "That was when I realized that must be what he put in my pocket." The lockup keeper put the money back in his pocket. He stayed in the 21<sup>st</sup> District Lockup until he was transported to court. He stated "when I was processing in for detention, all my property was inventoried including the hundred dollars (\$100.00). I have a receipt in my cell." The Reporting Investigator asked the complainant if he told anyone else in the building about the missing money, he replied "No." He could not give a reason why. I asked him why he didn't ask to speak with a supervisor about \$1,800.00 since that was a lot of money and some of it was his girlfriend's, he said "I just didn't." He was then asked to mail a copy of the receipt to the district for inclusion with my report. The copy arrived in an envelop on 22 May 2002 (Attachments #14,15,16). The receipt is for \$102.51.

During the interview, the complainant gave me an address and telephone number where I could contact his girlfriend, and her sister.

On 16 May 2002, I contacted [REDACTED] (Witness #2), sister of the female arrestee. In a telephone conversation with [REDACTED] I was advised that on the night of the incident her sister called her and said the police were going to take her to jail. She left her apartment to check on her sister. She indicated she was refused admission to the apartment when she arrived until the officers became aware she was the sister of the female arrestee. She said "I was finally admitted by the bald officer, Officer Terrence." [REDACTED] said her sister told her "I did not do anything, I was sleep." [REDACTED] stated she heard [REDACTED] (Nickname for the complainant) tell her sister "say that all the stuff in the house was yours, you would only go to jail for couple of hours and I could get you out." She went onto say that "Officer Terrence (accused #2) told her that the [REDACTED] was trying to get her sister to take the rap." [REDACTED] stated "[REDACTED] figured they would let him go and he would not have to take the blame for the stuff in the house." I asked [REDACTED] where she was when the police took her sister and the complainant from the apartment. She told me she waited with the people from the Chicago Housing Authority to fix her sister's door. Once the door and burglar gate were locked, she left. Upon her return the next day, people told her someone stole all of her sister's stuff. Upon inspecting the apartment, she noticed her sister's VCR, TV and other stuff was missing.

Following my conversation with [REDACTED] I spoke with [REDACTED] (arrestee - witness #1) about the incident. She advised me of the following: "I was in the bed sleep because I was sick. Earlier in the day I had a problem breathing so I took some medication. I first saw the police when they woke me up, and told me to put on some clothes. Once I had on clothes, I was handcuffed. The police told me I was under arrest because they found narcotics in my house." She stated that "when I told the police I knew nothing about any narcotics, they told me I could go if I gave them a gun." She states she told them she did not have a gun, and asked if she could call her sister. Shortly after talking to her sister on the phone, her sister arrived. I asked [REDACTED] about any money she had in the house. She replied "I had about \$30.00 in my jacket pocket and my baby had money in her bank." I asked how much of her income tax check did she have left. She replied "the \$30.00 I had in my pocket, I spent the rest of the money in February fixing up my apartment." She went on to say the check was for \$1,000.00 and her sister went with her to buy some things for the apartment. I advised her that [REDACTED] said there was \$1,800.00 taken from the apartment by the police and it was not returned or inventoried. It was at that point that she informed me "he was lying about the money." She made the following statement "He asked me to take the weight for the stuff. He said I'm gonna get you out. I asked him how did you get this stuff in my here. I had no idea the drugs were in the house. When I went to sleep nothing like drugs were in my house. I knew nothing until the police woke me up hours later." I asked what time she went to sleep and she replied "around 7PM." She stated she "knew [REDACTED] for a year, he was spending the night a lot, had a key, and there were no problems. Everything was fine. The first problem was when the police arrived." I asked her where [REDACTED] was while the police officers were writing their reports. She replied "Handcuffed to the rail next to me." When I asked her what happened when they took [REDACTED] handcuffs off the rail, she replied, "Officer Terrence took him down the stairs." It was during this part of the conversation that she advised me [REDACTED] (Complainant) had written her a letter instructing her what to say so they could beat the case. I asked if I could have a copy of the letter, she agreed. I went to [REDACTED] Street and met her in front of the building and was given a copy (Attachment# 14). (I was accompanied by Sergeant Kathleen O'Malley #2045, 021<sup>st</sup> District.) I asked her about her apartment door being secure when she left. I was told that her sister waited for a man named [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (complainant's Aunt) who both worked for the Chicago Housing Authority to repair the door.

I immediately went to the 24<sup>th</sup> and State Street where I met with [REDACTED] [REDACTED], Manager, Harold L. Ickes Development. [REDACTED] was aware of the incident where the door [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was damaged by the police making a forced entry for narcotic activity. I asked if he knew a man named [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED]. He advised me that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] worked for the Chicago Housing Authority. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were summoned to the office. In conversation with both men, I was advised that they were present when the police left with the two arrestees. [REDACTED] stated the arrestees sister waited for them to lock the apartment. [REDACTED] told me "I pulled to door shut, it caught. We pulled to burglar gate shut and locked it." [REDACTED] stated the apartment was broken into around 0200 hours, 29 March 2002. He was advised of the incident by a tenant asking him to secure the arrestee belongings.

Following the above interviews, meetings and collection of information, the accused members were served and provided reports of their allegations as follows:

**Sergeant Kevin Glover #1587**

**Allegation:** The complainant alleges that the accused refused to hear his complaint about the arresting officers taking his money. He alleges that the USC (\$1,800.00) was not inventoried when was arrested.

**Response:** The accused's report (Attachment #3) states "At no time did the suspect attempt to get the R/Sgt. attention to make a complainant about any money being taken."

**Response Support:** The Reporting Investigator asked the complainant if he told anyone else in the building about the missing money, he replied "No." He could not give a reason why. I asked him why he didn't ask to speak with a supervisor about \$1,800.00 since that was a lot of money and some of it was his girlfriend's, he said "I just didn't." The female arrestee stated "I had about \$30.00 in my jacket pocket and my baby had money in her bank." I asked how much of her income tax check did she have left. She replied "the \$30.00 I had in my pocket to buy my daughter a Easter Basket, I spent the rest of the money in February fixing up my apartment." She went on to say the check was for \$1,000.00 and her sister went with her to buy some things for the apartment. I advised her that [REDACTED] said there was \$1,800.00 taken from the apartment, and \$600.00 was hers and it was not returned or inventoried. It was at that point that she informed me "he was lying about the money."

**Police Officer Terrence Thompson #16744**

**Allegation #1 -** The complainant alleges that the accused failed to inventory \$1,800.00 USC that was recovered during his arrest.

**Response:** The accused's report (Attachment #4) states that "No time during the affect and processing of this arrest had opportunity to see or recover \$1800usc."

**Response Support:** The complainant stated that his money and the balance of his girlfriend's income tax check made up the \$1,800 that was taken and not inventoried. The complainant stated that twelve hundred dollars (\$1,200.00) was his. "The other six hundred (\$600.00) was my girl's." The girlfriend states that she spent all of the income tax check except \$30.00, which she was saving to buy her daughter a Easter Basket. The letter written to [REDACTED] from the complainant states (Attachment #14, page #3) *"Find your check stub or some proof that you got your income tax. Because you tell them they stole \$500 dollars from you, And they said it was drug money."*

**Allegation #2 -** The complainant alleges that the accused failed to secure the apartment door where he was arrested and the tenant's [REDACTED] (Also arrested) personal property was later stolen.

**Response:** The accused's report (Attachment #4) states "R/O's while on the scene radioed OEC to request immediate board up for said apt due to the fact that the apt. could not be secured. Moments later two CHA employees arrived at the apt. and advised that they would take care of the door."

**Response Support:** [REDACTED] informed this investigator that two employees of the Chicago Housing Authority arrived before she left the floor. Her sister waited for them to secure her door. The arrestee's sister, [REDACTED] stated that the door was locked by Chicago Housing Authority personnel, and the burglar gate was pulled shut and locked.

**Allegation #3 -** The complainant alleges that the accused took him to a room on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the 21<sup>st</sup> Police District where he put something in his right pocket (Alleged to be \$100.00 USC), and was told "Shut your fuckin mouth about the income tax money."

**Response:** The accused's report (Attachment #4) states "At no time did R/O place any item in complainants pocket nor did R/O use any profanity directed towards complainant while processing complainant."

**Response Support:** I asked [REDACTED] where [REDACTED] was while the police officers were writing their reports. She replied "Handcuffed to the rail next to me." When I asked her what happened when they took [REDACTED] handcuffs off the rail, she replied, "Officer Terry took him down the stairs."

**Allegation #4 -** The complainant alleges the accused conducted a warrant less search of the location where he was arrested.

**Response:** The accused's report (Attachment #4) states "On 28 Mar 02 R/O was assigned along with P.O. D. Weber #12200 to beat 2162A. During tour of duty R/O's were able to obtain information from an informant that cannabis was being sold out of apt [REDACTED] at the address of [REDACTED] R/O's at this time relocated to said address to set up surveillance of the apt. Moments later R/O's observed a male subject and complainant engage in a hand to hand transaction where the male was subsequently arrested for possession of cannabis. R/O's attempted to field interview complainant but he slammed the door in an attempt to avoid R/O's. R/O's at this time knocked on apt. door and announced office to no avail. Sgt. Dedore #2545 who was positioned under the window of apt. [REDACTED] radioed to R/O's that a male black, later known to be the complainant, was throwing cannabis out of the window. Sgt. Dedore was able to recover said items. R/O's at this time made a forced entry into apt. and then observed complainant attempting to flush cannabis down the toilet."



Response Support: In addition to the arrest of the complainant and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was arrested for possession of Cannabis that was given to him by the complainant prior to the officers attempting to gain access to the apartment ([REDACTED]).

The complainant's letter (Attachment #14, page #2) to [REDACTED] states "2 If both of us say you were sleep and I was woke then that means the police can say while you was sleep I served dude and that gave them the right to come in your crib." "3 If both of us say we were having sex then that means that you can testify that I didnt serve nobody. They did not have a search warrant so they have to drop the case."

In summary:

The complainant wrote a letter to the Chicago Defender making the allegations that were fully investigated. During the investigation, every allegation was addressed as given by the complainant. It is apparent by the letter he wrote to the female arrestee [REDACTED] instructing her on what to say, and when to say it, was to get the greatest impact towards discrediting the arresting officers. As he states in his letter (Attachment #14, page #1) to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] "I read what you said and I told the pd that I don't live there because if I say that I live there they are going to say I had a key and they chased me in there. If we say I don't live there and I don't have a key then they are lying about chasing me in there." ***This statement contradicts his statement to me that he and his girlfriend were sleep when the police broke into the apartment.***

His letter (Attachment #14, page #1) goes on to say: "I am working on everything we have to say in court so both of us can beat the case. We will if you say what I tell you to say. The hole reason we can beat this case is if we prove they broke in because someone told them they would find something. They have to have a search warrent to break in your house." "Don't let nobody tell you to say something else in trial because we will loose the case if you say something different than me. Don't get up there and say you were sleep. Maybe I have to explain this to you over the phone whenever I get to talk to you because it seems like you just don't get it. You have no background so if our storys are the same they have to believe us. The only way we can beat this is if both of us say we were having sex when the police started to break in." ***Asking her to say they were having sex is his way of eliminating the possibility that she was sleep, thus giving him the opportunity to sell narcotics to [REDACTED] (arrested following the transaction at the door) without her knowledge. This statement supports the officers position that the complainant was at the door selling cannabis.*** As he states later in his letter "***When we testify that we were having sex and I did not serve dude that's going to let us both off anyway, that's what I am trying to do. When I testify and say that the weed was mine that's going to stop you from loosing your crib.***"

He goes on to say "Find your check stub or some proof that you got your income tax. Because you tell them they stole \$500 dollars from you. And they said it was drug money. That statement they said I made doesn't mean anything because I did not sign it and they don't have it on tape because I did not say that. What I said was that they stole your income tax money. They said that, because they are scared that I am going to tell that they stole the money and they will get in trouble." *This portion of the letter is disputed by [REDACTED] When asked about any money she had in the house. She replied "I had about \$30.00 in my jacket pocket and my baby had money in her bank." I asked how much of her income tax check did she have left. She replied "the \$30.00 I had in my pocket, I spent the rest of the money in February fixing up my apartment." She went on to say the check was for \$1,000.00 and her sister went with her to buy some things for the apartment. I advised her that [REDACTED] said there was \$1,800.00 taken from the apartment, \$600.00 was hers by the police and it was not returned or inventoried. It was at that point that she informed me "he was lying about the money." The complainant told me during the initial interview that the officers found "Weed and Money." "It was \$1,800.00 in there, some of the money was in my bag with the weed." When asked what he meant by "in there, he replied "the back room." When asked how much money was in his bag, he replied "twelve hundred dollars (\$1,200.00). The other six hundred (\$600.00) was my girl's." "There was money in her jacket, but I don't know how much." "She had an income tax check, some of it she spent."*

Based on the facts documented above from the witnesses, employees of the Chicago Housing Authority, the accused members, and the letter written to [REDACTED] by the complainant, this investigation is concluded. It is obvious that the complainant, who is a career criminal (mostly drug related arrests) has manufactured the allegations to better his position in court. He has been arrested ten (10) times, six (6) were for felonies and four (4) for misdemeanor offenses. He currently has a total of five (5) convictions of his ten (10) total arrests. Using the Chicago Defender Newspaper as a conduit to get his message out was merely a way, he believed, to bring credibility to the issues. The police officers acted professionally at all times, and this is based on information from the female arrestee [REDACTED] her sister [REDACTED] and the agents for the Chicago Housing Authority. The complainant cannot not be allowed to sully the reputation of the officers that were acting on information that resulted in his capture simply to ease his burden during the court proceedings. The findings and my recommendations are listed in the appropriate section of the Summary Report Digest.